

II. REMARKS

1. Claims 1-10 remain in the application.
2. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 7-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants believe that these claims are patentable as they stand for the reasons stated below.
3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 are not anticipated by Hamano (US 6,366,463) under 35 USC 102(b).

Hamano fails to disclose or suggest the heat sink being pivoted by the insertion of the equipment module such that a surface of the heat sink is brought into contact with a surface of the equipment module, as recited by claim 1.

Hamano's heat sink does not pivot by the insertion of the equipment module in order to bring the heat sink in contact with the equipment module. By unfastening screws 30, the heat sink 21 may be rotated away to exchange CPU 16, however, the heat does not pivot when inserted into an equipment module to contact the equipment module. Rather, the heat sink 21 is fastened by screws 30 to printed circuit board 15. The heat sink is also fastened to a heat pipe 22 which in turn is fastened to the equipment frame acting as a heat radiation plate. There is no disclosure related to pivoting the heat sink by insertion into the equipment module, and nothing related to bringing the heat sink into contact with the equipment module.

Hamano deals with a cooling mechanism for a CPU in a laptop. As seen in figures 8 and 11 heat sink 21 pivots about equipment frame 20 to cover CPU 16. Column 4, lines 36-53 of Hamano describe providing a heat sink which satisfies CPUs which have different power consumption and therefore different heat dissipation requirements. It is clear from the description and drawings that the CPU is inserted into the equipment frame and then the heat sink is rotated downward to make contact with the CPU. Nowhere in the description or in the drawing is there a disclosure of the heat sink being pivoted by the insertion of the CPU into the equipment frame.

At least for these reasons, Applicants submit that Hamano fails to anticipate independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10.

4. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are not anticipated by Yan et al. (US 6,447,322, "Yan") under 35 USC 102(a).

Yan, like Hamano, fails to disclose or suggest the heat sink being pivoted by the insertion of the equipment module such that a surface of the heat sink is brought into contact with a surface of the equipment module, as recited by claim 1.

Yan discloses a test socket for reducing damage to an electronic assembly caused when heat sinks make contact with the assembly (column 1, lines 20-22). Figures 1 and 2 show that heat sinks 20 are pivotally attached to the holder 14 by arms 18 and controlled by springs 60. The electronic assembly 12 is inserted into the holder 14 (see column 2, lines 29-30). The springs 60 are then released (column 2, lines 36-37) and the heat sinks lowered to make thermal contact with the integrated circuit under test. When testing is complete, the heat sinks

are pivoted away from the test position, the electronic assembly 12 is removed from the holder 14, and another assembly is inserted into the holder in a similar manner. The heat sinks are then again pivoted towards the electronic assembly and the assembly is tested (column 3, lines 36-46). There is nothing in Yan related to an arrangement whereby the heat sink is pivoted by insertion of the electronic test assembly 12 such that the surface of the heat sink is brought into contact with the assembly.

Both Hamano and Yan, cited by the Examiner, require the integrated circuit or CPU to be inserted into its holder and then, in a separate step, the heat sinks to be moved into place to make contact with the integrated circuit or CPU. This is in contrast to the present invention as recited by claim 1 whereby it is the action of inserting the equipment module into the alignment means that causes the heat sink to be pivoted in such a way that a surface of the heat sink is brought into contact with a surface of the equipment module.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Yan fails to anticipate independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 6.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gamberdelli Jr.
Joseph V. Gamberdelli, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,695

29 March 2005

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450.

Date: 3/29/2005 Signature: Mary M. Hinman
Person Making Deposit